

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,003	09/09/2003	Douglas S. Forrer	PTH-20404/08	2277
25006	7590 07/11/2005		EXAM	INER
GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE & CITKOWSKI, P.C PO BOX 7021 TROY, MI 48007-7021			SINGH, SUNIL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3673	
		·	DATE MAILED: 07/11/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/658,003	FORRER, DOUGLAS S.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Sunil Singh	3673	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 24 June 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). **AMENDMENTS** 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 13. Other: \_\_\_\_\_. Sunil Singh Primary Examiner funds

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that a prima facie case of obviousness can be overcome when "the range is critical", merely by showing that the claimed range achieves unexpected results relative to the prior art range. Applicant failed to provide comparative data between prior art products and claimed invention, in particular, there is no comparison between the tensile strength and flexural modulus of the prior art products in comparison with the claimed invention. Applicant provided a list stating certain products having types Class A, B, C or E. However, it is unclear if the only differences between these products and applicant's invention are the tensile strength and flexural modulus; for example, different geometric shaped pavement markers can behave differently. Applicant argues that it is not obvious to one skilled in the art to chose a poly(methyl methacrylate) having a tensile strength greater than 10,000 psi and flexural modulus greater than 450,000 psi to make a pavement marker. The examiner disagrees. Heenan explicitly teaches his pavement marker is made out of methyl methacrylate (see col. 4 line 40+); however, Heenan does not explicitly disclose the properties of methyl methacrylate. The examiner then relied on specifications of "Acrylic (Polymethyl-Methacrylate) which specifically teaches polymethyl-methacrylate have tensile strengths between 8000-11000 psi and flexural modulus between 350,000-500,000 psi. The examiner further relied on "Canadian Building Digest" (page 5 of 7), wherein it is explicitly stated that typical tensile and flexural modulus values of poly(methyl-mehtacrylate) are 10,000 psi and 500,000 psi. Such knowledge is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art and therefore, it would have been considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use tensile strengths as high as 11,000 psi and flexural modulus as high as 500,000 psi when making the pavement marker in order to withstand heavy impact from traffic loads.

HEIMANER BINGERANINER

SUMIL SAUGH PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER